

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

[Faculty Senate Index](#)

[Faculty Senate Documents](#)

4-17-2013

Follow-up to Response to 4/1/2013 RFI Georgia Southern University's Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups""

Scott Beck

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Beck, Scott, "Follow-up to Response to 4/1/2013 RFI Georgia Southern University's Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups"" (2013). *Faculty Senate Index*. 139.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/139>

This request for information is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Follow-up to “Response to 4/1/2013 RFI ‘Georgia Southern University’s Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups’”

Submitted by: Scott Beck

4/17/2013

Question:

Follow-Up Regarding 4/1/2013 RFI Question #1:

How can Georgia Southern's administration's assertion that “Our partnerships ... are not intended as political alliances or statements on behalf of the institution” be reconciled with CSF's description of support from ‘Partners’ like Georgia Southern: “Support of the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation ... is the single most powerful action you can take as an individual, company or organization to protect and advance sportsmen's interests in the political arena. At the CSF, we know how important it is to have an effective voice in the political arena looking out for your interests.”?

Does Georgia Southern's administration plan to ask that our institution's name be removed from the list of CSF ‘Sustaining Partners’?

Is Georgia Southern's administration considering any policies to avoid any future representations of our university as supporting pro-gun lobby groups and political causes?

What were the total “event attendance and costs associated with travel and participation” in the CSF banquet in Washington, DC in December 2012?

Follow-Up Regarding 4/1/2013 RFI Question #4:

When did Georgia Southern's administration first consider applying to the National Shooting Sports Foundation Grant program?

Was the political agenda of the NSSF considered by Georgia Southern's administration when deciding whether to apply for the grant? If so, what concerns were raised?

Who initiated Georgia Southern's NSSF Grant application, when, and under whose authority?

When was Georgia Southern's NSSF Grant application completed and submitted?

When was the \$25,000 NSSF Grant awarded to Georgia Southern?

How does the timeline of the NSSF grant process relate to Georgia Southern's administration's assertion in "Response to 11/2/2011 RFI 'On-Campus Gun Range'" that the Shooting Center was borne out of an initial contact by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources ("The DNR approached the University")?

When did that meeting between Georgia Southern's administration and Georgia DNR regarding the Shooting Center take place?

Rationale:

The "Response to 4/1/2013 RFI 'Georgia Southern University's Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups'" from GSU's administration claims that "Our partnerships ... are not intended as political alliances or statements on behalf of the institution."

However, that is not the way these partnerships are interpreted and represented by the pro-gun lobby groups themselves. Pro-gun lobbyists clearly understand such partnerships as political actions endorsing their policies. Moreover, they publicize such partnerships as political support. The CSF website explicitly states regarding its 'Partners' – including Georgia Southern:

"Support of the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation ... is the single most powerful action you can take as an individual, company or organization to protect and advance sportsmen's interests in the political arena. At the CSF, we know how important it is to have an effective voice in the political arena looking out for your interests." <http://www.sportsmenslink.org/about/partners/>

Given this, it is certain that the average US citizen and Georgia taxpayer would interpret the listing of our university's name on the CSF 'Partners' webpage as

support for the group's primary purpose: political lobbying on behalf of pro-gun interests. CSF's political agenda includes:
Opposing the microstamping of gun parts to allow easier ballistics identification during the investigation of violent crimes.

<http://www.sportsmenslink.org/policies/state/microstamping>

Arguing that the capacity of assault weapon magazines "is a matter that should be left to the discretion of the individual gun owners" and should not be subject to any governmental regulation. <http://www.sportsmenslink.org/policies/state/full-capacity-magazines>

Opposing any regulation of semi-automatic firearms.
<http://www.sportsmenslink.org/policies/state/modern-sporting-rifle>

As stated in the 4/1/2013 RFI, it is "highly inappropriate for a publicly-funded institution of higher education to support a controversial and politically active lobbying group."

A parallel argument can be made regarding Georgia Southern's involvement with the official lobbying organization for the firearms industry, the National Shooting Sports Foundation. As described by the Georgia Southern administration, the simple presence of representatives of an institution of higher education at the NSSF Shooting Sports Summit in June 2011 was apparently surprising to attendees:

"Similar interests (sic) as to why a University was in attendance began to cascade across the Summit participants and we shared our project with those who asked. This generated excitement around this concept possibly led to the tweet by Chis Dolnac. (sic)"

Georgia Southern's presence at the Shooting Sports Summit and the Shooting Center initiative were clearly points of pride for the NSSF. The man most concerned with advancing the image and cause of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, NSSF Chief Marketing Officer Chris Dolnack immediately posted a tweet regarding Georgia Southern.

Although Georgia Southern's administration claims that such situations are not political statements, groups like the NSSF do not appear to agree. Given this, it is reasonable for the average citizen and taxpayer to interpret Georgia Southern's involvement with the NSSF as support for the group's primary purpose: lobbying on behalf of the gun industry.

The NSSF's lobbying priorities and political agenda echo that of CSF and include:

Opposing universal background checks for gun buyers. <http://fixnics.org/why.cfm>
Opposing the microstamping of gun parts to allow easier ballistics identification during the investigation of violent crimes.

<http://www.nssf.org/factsheets/PDF/Microstamping.pdf>

Opposing a ban on high-capacity magazines.

<http://www.nssf.org/factsheets/PDF/HighCapMag.pdf> Opposing any regulation of semi-automatic firearms. <http://www.nssf.org/factsheets/semi-auto.cfm>

SEC Response:

5/28/2013: This RFI was approved for inclusion on the agenda of the June 4th senate meeting, and directed to Teresa Thompson, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management.

Senate Response:

6/4/2013 Minutes: RFI (Beck): Follow-up to "Response to 4/1/2013 RFI 'Georgia Southern University's Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups'" A response had not been posted yet, so there was nothing to discuss yet.